

Exhibit A

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**IN RE GOOGLE DIGITAL ADVERTISING
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

No. 21-md-3010 (PKC)

This Stipulation Relates To:

THE STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

- against -

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

No. 21-CV-6841 (PKC)

**SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING
STATE PLAINTIFFS' STATE LAW CLAIMS**

Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) and Plaintiffs State of Texas, State of Alaska, State of Arkansas, State of Florida, State of Idaho, State of Indiana, Commonwealth of Kentucky, State of Louisiana, State of Mississippi, State of Missouri, State of Montana, State of Nevada, State of North Dakota, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, State of South Carolina, State of South Dakota, and State of Utah (collectively “State Plaintiffs”; the State Plaintiffs and Google combined are the “Parties”) stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, paragraphs 546 through 602 (Count V) of State Plaintiffs’ Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195) (“*TAC*”) describe State Plaintiffs’ state antitrust claims;

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2022, the Court issued its Opinion and Order on Google's Motion to Dismiss Counts I Through IV of the States' Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 308, the "Opinion and Order");

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2022, the Court issued Pre-Trial Order No. 4, ordering State Plaintiffs and Google to meet and confer on a stipulation as to the effect of the Opinion and Order on any of the State Plaintiffs' state law claims and to report to the Court within 21 days (*see* ECF No. 392, ¶ 4);

WHEREAS, on December 9, 2022, pursuant to Pre-Trial Order No. 4, the Parties submitted a stipulation (the "First Stipulation") to the Court regarding the effect of the Opinion and Order on any of the State Plaintiffs' state law claims (*see* ECF No. 415);

WHEREAS, paragraph 2 of the First Stipulation stated that, "[a]ny state law antitrust claim is deemed dismissed to the extent that it is based on conduct alleged to serve as a basis for a federal antitrust claim that the Opinion and Order dismissed";

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2022, the Court so ordered the Parties' First Stipulation, and in so doing, added the following proviso: "[b]y February 24, 2023, the parties shall submit a stipulation describing with particularity, the claims or portions of claims governed by paragraph 2 [of the First Stipulation]," (ECF No. 417, at 3); and

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties, through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that the Network Bidding Agreement between Google and Meta Platforms, Inc. (f/k/a as Facebook) (the "NBA") constitutes an illegal contract, combination or conspiracy, such claim is hereby deemed dismissed.

2. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Encrypted User IDs constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for ad exchanges, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

3. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Dynamic Allocation ("DA") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

4. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Enhanced Dynamic Allocation ("EDA") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

5. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Dynamic Revenue Share ("DRS") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

6. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Reserve Price Optimization ("RPO") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for ad exchanges, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

7. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Exchange Bidding constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for ad exchanges, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

8. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Accelerated Mobile Pages ("AMP") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for ad exchanges, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

9. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on Google's use of Privacy Sandbox, such claim is deemed to be unripe for determination.

10. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges in the TAC a state antitrust claim based on Google's use of DA, Google's use of DRS, or Google's combined use of DA and DRS, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct has continuing adverse effects.

11. As a result of the Opinion and Order, no State Plaintiff will further pursue in this litigation any state antitrust claim that (a) the NBA constitutes an illegal contract, combination or conspiracy; (b) Google's use of Encrypted User IDs, EDA, RPO, Exchange Bidding, or AMP constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization; and/or (c) Google's use of DA or DRS constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools. In addition, no State Plaintiff will further pursue in this litigation any state antitrust claim for injunctive relief based on allegations related to DA or DRS.

12. State Plaintiffs have not alleged in the TAC that (a) Google's use of Encrypted User IDs constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for publisher ad servers;

(b) Google's use of RPO constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools; (c) Google's use of Exchange Bidding constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for publisher ad servers; or (d) Google's use of AMP constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for publisher ad servers.

13. The Parties have not reached any agreement—and this Stipulation does not take a position—as to whether any State Plaintiff has alleged or may pursue any claim that (a) the NBA violates any state antitrust law prohibiting monopolization or attempted monopolization; (b) Google's use of Encrypted User IDs, DA, EDA, DRS, RPO, Exchange Bidding, or AMP violates any state antitrust law prohibiting monopolization or attempted monopolization of any market other than those identified in paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, respectively; and/or (c) Google's use of Encrypted User IDs, DA, EDA, DRS, RPO, Exchange Bidding, or AMP violates any state antitrust law other than those prohibiting monopolization or attempted monopolization.

14. It is Google's position that the state antitrust claims described in paragraph 13 should be dismissed for the reasons described in the Opinion and Order and that the parties' lack of agreement will require Google to file a motion to dismiss some or all of them.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: February 24, 2023

For Plaintiff States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana (The Lanier Law Firm only), Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota:

s/ Ashley Keller

Ashley Keller
Admitted Pro Hac Vice
ack@kellerpostman.com
Jason A. Zweig
jaz@kellerpostman.com
Brooke Clason Smith
brooke.smith@kellerpostman.com
150 N. Riverside Plaza, Suite 4100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 741-5220
Zina Bash
zina.bash@kellerpostman.com
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 500
Austin, TX 78701
(501) 690-0990
KELLER POSTMAN LLC

/s/ Mark Lanier

W. Mark Lanier (*lead counsel*)
Texas Bar No. 11934600
Mark.Lanier@LanierLawFirm.com
Alex J. Brown
Alex.Brown@LanierLawFirm.com
Zeke DeRose III
Zeke.DeRose@LanierLawFirm.com
10940 W. Sam Houston Parkway N. Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77064
Telephone: (713) 659-5200
Facsimile: (713) 659-2204
THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C.

*Attorneys for Plaintiff States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana (The Lanier Law Firm only),
Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota*

/s/ **DRAFT**

Eric Mahr
FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS DERINGER US LLP
700 13th Street, NW
10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 777-4545
Email: eric.mahr@freshfields.com

Justina K. Sessions
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation
One Market Plaza
Spear Tower, Suite 3300
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 947-2197
Email: jsessions@wsgr.com

Counsel for Defendant Google LLC

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF TEXAS:

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General

/s/ Shawn E. Cowles

Brent Webster, First Assistant Attorney
General of Texas

Brent.Webster@oag.texas.gov

Grant Dorfman, Deputy First Assistant
Attorney General

Grant.Dorfman@oag.texas.gov

Aaron Reitz, Deputy Attorney General for
Legal Strategy Aaron.Reitz@oag.texas.gov

Shawn E. Cowles, Deputy Attorney
General for Civil Litigation

Shawn.Cowles@oag.texas.gov Nanette

DiNunzio, Associate Deputy Attorney
General for Civil Litigation

Nanette.Dinunzio@oag.texas.gov

James R. Lloyd, Chief, Antitrust
Division

James.Lloyd@oag.texas.gov

Trevor Young, Deputy Chief,
Antitrust Division

Trevor.Young@oag.texas.gov

Ralph Molina, Assistant Attorney General,
General Litigation Division

Ralph.Molina@oag.texas.gov

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

P.O. Box 12548

Austin, TX 78711-2548

(512) 936-1674

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Texas

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ALASKA:

TREG R. TAYLOR
Attorney General

By : /s/ Jeff Pickett
Jeff Pickett
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Special Litigation Section
jeff.pickett@alaska.gov

Attorney for Plaintiff State of Alaska

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ARKANSAS:

TIM GRIFFIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: /s/ Johnathan R. Carter
Johnathan R. Carter – AR Bar # 2007105 Assistant
Attorney General
Office of the Arkansas Attorney General 323 Center
Street, Suite 200
Little Rock, AR 72201 Phone:
501.682.8063
Fax: 501.682.8118
Email: Johnathan.Carter@Arkansasag.gov

Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arkansas

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF FLORIDA:

ASHLEY MOODY, Attorney General

/s/ R. Scott Palmer

R. SCOTT PALMER, Special Counsel, Complex Enforcement
Chief, FL Bar No. 220353

JOHN GUARD, Chief Deputy Attorney General

LEE ISTRAIL, Assistant Attorney General

CHRISTOPHER KNIGHT, Assistant Attorney General

ANDREW BUTLER, Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida

PL-01 The Capitol

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-414-3300

Email: scott.palmer@myfloridalegal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Florida

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF IDAHO:

RAUL R. LABRADOR
Attorney General

/s/ John K. Olson

John K. Olson, Acting Division Chief, Consumer Protection Division


Consumer Protection Division
Office of the Attorney General 954
W. Jefferson Street, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0010
Telephone: (208) 334-2424
brett.delange@ag.idaho.gov
john.olson@ag.idaho.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Idaho

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF INDIANA:

THEODORE E. ROKITA
Attorney General

The Office of the Indiana Attorney General

By: 

Scott Barnhart
Chief Counsel and Director of Consumer Protection
Indiana Atty. No. 25474-82
Indiana Government Center South – 5th Fl. 302 W.
Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770
Phone: (317) 232-6309
Fax: (317) 232-7979
Email: scott.barnhart@atg.in.gov



Matthew Michaloski
Deputy Attorney General
Indiana Atty. No. 35313-49
Indiana Government Center South – 5th Fl. 302 W.
Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770
Phone: (317) 234-1479
Fax: (317) 232-7979
Email: matthew.michaloski@atg.in.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Indiana

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY:

DANIEL CAMERON
Attorney General

J. Christian Lewis
Commissioner of the Office of Consumer Protection

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Christian Lewis", is written over a horizontal line.

Christian.Lewis@ky.gov

Philip R. Heleringer, Executive Director of the Office of Consumer Protection

Philip.Heleringer@ky.gov

Jonathan E. Farmer, Deputy Executive Director of the Office of Consumer Protection

Jonathan.Farmer@ky.gov

Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Kentucky
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Tel: 502-696-5300

Attorneys for Commonwealth of Kentucky

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF LOUISIANA:

HON. JEFF LANDRY
ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF LOUISIANA
Michael Dupree
Christopher J. Alderman
1885 N. 3rd Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

s/ James R. Dugan, II
James R. Dugan, II (*pro hac vice*)
TerriAnne Benedetto (*pro hac vice*)
The Dugan Law Firm
365 Canal Street
One Canal Place, Suite 1000
New Orleans, LA 70130 PH:
(504) 648-0180
FX: (504) 649-0181
EM: jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com
tbenedetto@dugan-lawfirm.com

James Williams
CHEHARDY SHERMAN WILLIAM, LLP
Galleria Boulevard, Suite 1100
Metairie, LA 70001
PH: (504) 833-5600
FX: (504) 833-8080
EM: jmw@chehardy.com

Attorneys for the State of Louisiana

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:

LYNN FITCH, ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

By: /s/ Hart Martin

Hart Martin

Consumer Protection Division Mississippi

Attorney General's Office Post Office Box 220

Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Telephone: 601-359-4223

Fax: 601-359-4231

Hart.martin@ago.ms.gov

Attorney for Plaintiff State of Mississippi

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MISSOURI:

ANDREW BAILEY
Attorney General

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amy Haywood". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Amy.Haywood@ago.mo.gov
Missouri Attorney General's Office
P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Tel: 816-889-3090

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Missouri

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:

AUSTIN KNUDSEN
Montana Attorney General

/s/ David M.S. Dewhirst
DAVID M.S. DEWHIRST
Solicitor General
P.O. Box 200151
Helena, MT 59620-0151
Phone: (406) 444-4500
Fax: (406) 442-1894
david.dewhirst@mt.gov
mmattioli@mt.gov

/s/ Charles J. Cooper Charles J.
Cooper ccooper@cooperkirk.com
David H. Thompson
dthompson@cooperkirk.com Brian
W. Barnes bbarnes@cooperkirk.com
Harold S. Reeves
hreeves@cooperkirk.com COOPER
& KIRK PLLC
1523 New Hampshire Avenue, NW Washington DC
20036
Phone: (202) 220-9620
Fax: (202) 220-9601

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Montana

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEVADA:

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General
ERNEST D. FIGUEROA
Consumer Advocate

/s/ Michelle C. Newman

Michelle C. Newman, Senior Deputy
Attorney General
mnewman@ag.nv.gov
Lucas J. Tucker (NV Bar No. 10252)
Senior Deputy Attorney General
LTucker@ag.nv.gov
Office of the Nevada Attorney General
100 N. Carson St.
Carson City, Nevada 89701 Tel:
(775) 684-1100

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nevada

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA:

DREW H. WRIGLEY
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
Attorney General

By: /s/ Elin S. Alm
Parrell D. Grossman, ND ID 04684 Elin S.
Alm, ND ID 05924
Assistant Attorneys General
Consumer Protection & Antitrust Division Office of
Attorney General of North Dakota
1720 Burlington Drive, Suite C, Bismarck, ND 58503-7736 (701)
328-5570
(701) 328-5568 (fax)
pgrossman@nd.gov ealm@nd.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North Dakota

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO:

/s/ Domingo Emanuelli-Hernández

Domingo Emanuelli-Hernández

Attorney General

Thaizza Rodríguez Pagán

Assistant Attorney General

PR Bar No. 17177

P.O. Box 9020192

San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902-0192 Tel:

(787) 721-2900, ext. 1201, 1204

trodriguez@justicia.pr.gov

Kyle G. Bates

HAUSFELD LLP

600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200

San Francisco, CA 94111

Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

/s/ Mary Frances Jowers
Rebecca M. Hartner (S.C. Bar No. 101302)
Assistant Attorney General
W. Jeffrey Young
Chief Deputy Attorney General
C. Havird Jones, Jr.
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
Mary Frances Jowers
Assistant Deputy Attorney General
South Carolina Attorney General's Office
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549
Phone: 803-734-3970
Email: rhartner@scag.gov
mfjowers@scag.gov

Charlie Condon
Charlie Condon Law Firm, LLC
880 Johnnie Dodds Blvd, Suite 1
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464 Phone:
843-884-8146
Email: charlie@charliecondon.com

James R. Dugan, II (*pro hac vice*)
The Dugan Law Firm
365 Canal Street
One Canal Place, Suite 1000
New Orleans, LA 70130 Phone:
(504) 648-0180
Email: jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of South Carolina

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA:

MARTY JACKLEY
Attorney General

/s/ Yvette K. Lafrentz Yvette
K. Lafrentz Assistant
Attorney General
Consumer Protection Division
South Dakota Office of the Attorney General
1302 E. Hwy. 14, Suite 1
Pierre, SD 57501
P: 605.773.3215 F:605.773.4106
Yvette.lafrentz@state.sd.us

Attorney for Plaintiff State of South Dakota

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF UTAH:

Sean D. Reyes
Utah Attorney General

/s/ Tara Pincock

Tara Pincock
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Section Office of
the Utah Attorney General
160 E 300 S, 5th Floor
PO Box 140874
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872 Telephone: 385-
881-3958
Fax: 801-366-0315

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Utah and as counsel for the Utah Division of Consumer Protection

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: _____

Hon. P. Kevin Castel
United States District Court
Southern District of New York